THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.5431 of 2007

30.4.2007

Between:

Smt.Shahnaz Begum

... Petitioner

AND

The Special Officer & Competent Authority,
ULC, Hyderabad And others

... Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.5431 of 2007

ORDER:

The petitioner is allegedly owner of land admeasuring Acs.62.00 (out of Acs.196.20 gts) situated at Hyderanagar village of Balanagar Mandal in Ranga Reddy District, by reason of a preliminary decree in C.S.No.14 of 1958 passed by this Court. She submitted a declaration under Section 6(1) of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976 (ULC Act, for brevity) declaring the urban land and claiming that it is agricultural land. She alleges that the first respondent has initiated enquiry into the declaration and, therefore, petitioner seeks a writ of Mandamus directing the first respondent to do so.

The writ petition was heard on 16.3.2007 at preliminary stage and was adjourned to enable learned Standing Counsel for Urban Land Ceiling (ULC) cases to get instructions/file counter affidavit.

The Special Tahsildar, Zone-II in the office of first respondent filed counter affidavit. It is *inter alia* stated that the declaration of the petitioner was referred to the Verification Officer, who submitted a report on 28.9.2006 stating that the land allegedly held by the petitioner is recorded, in the revenue records, as Government land. Therefore, a draft statement under Section 8(1) of ULC Act was issued along with the notice, which was dispatched on 16.4.2007. A copy of the proceedings dated 16.4.2007 (draft statement) is also annexed to the counter affidavit.

A perusal of the proceedings of the Special Officer bearing No.H1/1419/2006, dated 16.4.2007, would prove that the petitioner's application has been duly processed and she does not hold the land as declared by her as on the date of commencement of ULC Act and she is, therefore, declared as no title holder. She was advised to file a fresh statement under Section 15 of ULC Act as and when she gets title to the property. The said proceedings are made part of the record. In view of the orders passed by the first respondent, nothing survives in

this writ petition.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

(**V.V.S.RAO, J**)

April 30, 2007.
YS